REMARKS

The aforementioned Office Action rejected claims 1, 4, 10, 12-14, 23-26 and 28, objected to claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11 and 15-22 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form, and allowed claims 27, 29 and 30. While applicants do not agree with the rejections of claims 1, 4, 10, 12-14, 23-26 and 28, and reserve the right to further prosecute these claims in divisional and/or continuation applications, the applicants desire to secure some protection for their invention as early as possible. Accordingly, the present amendment cancels the rejected claims 1, 13, 14, 25, 26 and 28, and rewrites claims 2, 8, 9, 15, 17, 21 and 22 in independent form. Claims 4, 10 and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 2 rather than claim 1, and claims 23 and 24 have been amended to depend from claim 15 rather than claim 14. Accordingly, since all remaining original claims are allowable for reasons stated in the Office Action.

Claims 31-72 have been added to give applicants the full scope of protection to which they believe they are entitled. Claim 31 is directed to a method according to claim 30 in which the display is of the direct drive type having a plurality of pixels each of which is provided with a separate electrode, the display further comprising switching means arranged to control independently the voltage applied to each electrode, and is based, *inter alia*, on Paragraph [0215], first sentence of the specification. Claim 32 is directed to a method according to claim 30 in which the display comprises a plurality of pixels and there is applied to the display at intervals a blanking pulse which drives all the pixels of the display to substantially the same display state, and measurement of the remnant voltage is effected after such a blanking pulse, and is based, *inter alia*, on Paragraph [0217], last sentence of the specification. Claims 33 and 34 are directed to methods according to claim 30 in which the display is, respectively, an electrophoretic display and an encapsulated electrophoretic display; these claims are based, *inter alia*, on Paragraph [0218] of the specification. Claim 35 is directed to a method according to claim 30 in which the electro-optic medium is of the microcell type defined in Paragraph

[0014] of the specification. Similarly, claim 36 is directed to a method according to claim 30 in which the display is of the passive matrix type mentioned in Paragraph [0091] of the specification.

Claim 37 is directed to a method according to claim 2 wherein there is applied to said one pixel in succession a pre-pulse which drives said one pixel to one of its extreme optical states, and an addressing pulse which drives said one pixel from said one extreme optical state to the desired final state. Similarly, claim 37 is directed to a method according to claim 2 wherein there is applied to said one pixel in succession a first pre-pulse which drives said one pixel to one of its extreme optical states, a second pre-pulse which drives said one pixel from said one extreme optical state to the opposed extreme optical state, and an addressing pulse which drives said one pixel from said opposed extreme optical state to the desired final state. These two claims are based, *inter alia*, on Figures 9 and 10 and the associated description at Paragraphs [0167] to [0171] of the specification. These Figures and Paragraphs describe so-called "n-prepulse slide show" waveforms in which pre-pulses are used to drive the electro-optic medium to one of its extreme optical states (typically black and white), and then to the other extreme optical state, before a drive (addressing) pulse is used to drive the medium to its final desired gray level. Claims 36 and 37 are directed to the simplest such pre-pulse slide show waveforms in which either 1 or 2 respectively pre-pulses are used.

Claim 39 is directed to a method according to claim 37 wherein the pixels of the display are divided into first and second groups and different pre-pulses are applied to the first and second groups so that the pre-pulse drives the first group of pixels to one extreme optical state and the second group of pixels to the opposed extreme optical state. This claim is based, *inter alia*, on Figures 9 and 10 and Paragraphs [0177] and [0178] of the description, which describe pre-pulse waveforms in which the pixels are divided into two groups which are driven to opposed extreme optical states.

Claims 40-43 are directed to methods according to claim 2 having the same features as claims 33-36 respectively, and have the same basis as claims 33-36, as discussed above.

Claims 44-50 are exactly parallel to claims 37-43 except that they depend from claim 8 rather than claim 2. Similarly, claims 51-57 are exactly parallel to claims 37-43 except that they depend from claim 9 rather than claim 2. Accordingly, it is believed that the bases for claims 44-57 will readily be apparent from the discussion of claims 37-43 above.

Claims 58 and 59 are directed to controllers according to claim 15 wherein the output means is arranged to generate pre-pulse waveforms as defined in claims 37 and 38 respectively. Accordingly, it is believed that the bases for claims 58 and 59 will readily be apparent from the discussion of claims 37 and 38 above. Claim 60 is directed to an electro-optic display having a controller according to claim 15, and is based, *inter alia*, on claim 15 itself.

Claims 61-63, claims 64-66, claims 67-69, and claims 70-72 are all exactly parallel to claims 58-60 except that they depend from, respectively, claims 17, 21, 22 and 27 rather than claim 15, and accordingly it is believed that the bases for claims 61-72 will readily be apparent from the discussion of claims 58-60 above.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in this application is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully suggested that, should the Examiner allow all claims now present in this application, the ease of comprehension of the resulting patent would be improved by rearranging the claims so that the dependent claims follow immediately after the claims from which they depend, and thus in the following order:

2-7, 10-12, 37-43

8, 44-50

9, 51-57

15, 16, 23, 24, 58-60

17-20, 61-63

21, 64-66

22, 67-69

27, 70-72

29

30-36.

A Fee Determination Record (Form PTO/SB/06) calculating the additional claim fees due as a result of this Amendment and a Fee Transmittal (Form PTO/SB/17) authorizing charging of these additional claim fees to the assignee's Deposit Account, are enclosed (the undersigned attorney appreciates that Form PTO/SB/17 is not well adapted for this situation but cannot find any other convenient method for paying the relevant fees).

Since the normal period for responding to the Office Action expired November 19, 2004, a Petition for a three-month extension of this period is filed herewith (in duplicate).

Respectfully submitted

David J. Cole
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation
733 Concord Avenue
Cambridge MA 02138-1002

Telephone (617) 499-6069
Fax (617) 499-6200
E-mail dcole@eink.com